



C-14253

फाइल सं. 1/27/91-Public
Part File No.
खण्ड
Volume

भारत सरकार
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
गृह मंत्रालय
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

खुशहाल बालिका भविष्य देश का
CARE FOR THE GIRL CHILD

अनुभाग
Public Section

.....को सूचीकृत की गई
Indexed on

टिप्पणियां/पत्राचार
NOTES/CORRESPONDENCE

अज्ञात
Initials

अभिलेख क/ख
Record A/B

अभिलेख ग.....में नष्ट किए गए
Record C Destroyed in

नोट किया जाए
नोट न किया जाए अनुभागीया नोट बुक

To be noted In Sectional Note Book
Not to be noted

अनु. अ./अधीक्षक के हस्ताक्षर
Initials of S.O./Supdt.

लिपिक के हस्ताक्षर
Initials of Clerk

विषय
SUBJECT

C.O. No. 6720(W)/1993, Bijan Ghosh Vs.
Union of India in connection with Bharat
Ratna Award to Netaji Sukhash Chandra Bose -
Bill submitted for professional charges
by Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Additional Solicitor
General for India.

Nothing - 20
Total - 20

पिछले हवाले
Previous References

बाद के हवाले
Later References



Ministry of Home Affairs

(Public Section)

Sl.No.1(Receipt) pp.1-6/cor. F.R.

"Please put up on file."

It'd.

Joint Secretary(Admn.)
4.10.1993.

v slip 'M'

In Writ Petition C.O. 6720(W) of 1993 - Bijan Ghosh Versus Union of India and others in the High Court of Calcutta, notice was served upon the Attorney General of India and the High Court expected the Attorney General to appear or to be properly represented. Accordingly, a reference was made to the Deputy Central Government Advocate, requesting him to get in touch with the Attorney General and arrange for his representation in the Court on the next date of hearing on 29th September, 1993.

2. The matter was discussed by Shri M. Venkateswara Iyer, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, with the Additional Solicitor General (Shri Altaf Ahmad) on 26th September, 1993. On 27th September, 1993, Shri P. Parneswaran, Deputy Central Govt. Advocate informed Shri Iyer, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs on phone that Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Additional Solicitor General has been asked by the Attorney General to appear on behalf of the Union of India and, if necessary, to represent Attorney General also in the High Court of Calcutta on 29th September, 1993. Accordingly, Shri Tulsi left Delhi in the evening of 28th September, 1993; attended the hearing on 29th September, 1993 and returned to Delhi by morning flight on 30th September, 1993.

x slip 'X'

3. According to O.M. No.F.18(1)/86-Judl. dated the 12th January, 1987, issued by the Department of Legal Affairs regarding revision of fee payable to Law Officers w.e.f. January, 1987, para 2(a) provides as under:-

"For appearances in the Supreme Court and High Courts at Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Karnataka, the expenditure in connection with the fee payable to Law Officers is to be borne by the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law and Justice. The fee bills are to be processed by the concerned Litigation Sections or the Branch Secretariat of this Department, as the case may be, and the payment is to be made to the Law Officers by them directly. However, the expenditure relating to TA/DA payable to Law Officers for their appearances in High Courts at Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Karnataka is to be borne by the Ministry/Departments on whose request the Law Officer conducts the case in the concerned High Court. "

Further, sub-para (b) of para 2 provides as under:-

"For appearance in various High Courts (other than those mentioned in (a) above, other Courts, before the Arbitrators, Commissions of Inquiry, Tribunals etc. and in cases conducted in foreign countries, the entire expenditure on account of the fee and TA/DA etc. payable to Law Officers is to be borne by the Ministry/Department concerned which engages them (through the Ministry of Law & Justice) to conduct the case on behalf of the Union of India."

...contd/-

4. Since the Additional Solicitor General put in an appearance in the High Court at Calcutta, in accordance with the provisions of para 2(a) referred to above, the fee bills are to be processed by the concerned Litigation Sections or the Branch Secretariat of the Department of Legal Affairs, as the case may be, and the payment is to be made to the Law Officers by them directly. However, expenditure relating to TA/DA is to be borne by the concerned Ministry on whose request the Law Officer conducted the case in the concerned High Court. Accordingly, all arrangements for boarding and lodging, transport and security (as demanded by Additional Solicitor General) were made by the Ministry of Home Affairs. However, the fee bill submitted by Shri Tulsi (placed below in original at Slip 'A') are to be settled by the Department of Legal Affairs themselves.

Removal and
sent to Sh. K. K. K.
vide slip A
letter dt 21.10.93
/M
11/10/93

5. In view of the position explained earlier regarding the circumstances for engaging the Additional Solicitor General to represent the Union of India and if necessary the Attorney General for India also, necessary approval by the Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs, may please be accorded. It is further requested that the fee bill submitted by the Additional Solicitor General may also be settled by the Department of Legal Affairs and this Ministry informed of the action taken in the matter.

6. It would not be out of place to mention here that the next date of hearing in this case has been fixed by the High Court of Calcutta on 6th December, 1993, when again Additional Solicitor General would be representing the Union of India.

7. After the above position has been seen and approved by JS(A), these papers will be sent to Department of Legal Affairs for necessary follow up action.

Submitted.

V.P. Bhatia
(V.P. Bhatia)
Under Secretary/12.10.93.

Director(~~OSM~~ & Vig.)

Discussed with J-S(A). The matter may be returned from the info Law and Inspire.

U.S. (P/b)

I have checked up the position from Judl. Section, Deptt of Legal Affairs. According to them, the instructions issued vide OM of 12.1.1987 are the latest and are in operation.

The file may now kindly be seen for approval of JS(A).

V.P. Bhatia
13.10.93

Director(~~OSM~~ & Vig.)

J-S(A)

13/10/93
B.10.93

Dir(OM & Vig)

U.S. (P/b)

5507 JS(A) 13/10/93

Reference notes from page 1/ ante.

2. Miny of Law, Dept. of Legal Affairs may kindly see for further necessary action with particular reference to paras 4 to 6 on preface.

(Prashant)

13.10.93

US(Pub/K & V4)

~~2687~~

2687

13/10/93

Miny of Law & Justice (Dept. of Legal Affairs) - Sh. U.K. Jha,
Asst. Legal Advisor, Room m. 441 - A. Sherhi Khann

MHA Ho m. 1/27/91 - Public dt. 13.10.93

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal is for the ex-post facto approval of engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Adl. Solicitor General, who was engaged by Ministry of Home Affairs in W.P. No.C.O. 6720(W)/93 - Bijan Ghosh vs. U.O.I. in the Calcutta High Court.

2. In this case the High Court had issued notice to the Attorney General. The Attorney General requested Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Adl. Solicitor General to appear on behalf of Union of India and to represent the Attorney General also in the High Court of Calcutta on 29-9-1993. The Adl. Solicitor General appeared accordingly in the Calcutta High Court on 29.9.1993. All arrangements were made by the Department. The case is again fixed for hearing on 6.12.1993 when Shri Tulsi would be representing the U.O.I. and the Attorney General again.

3. In view of the above, formal approval for the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi on his usual terms and conditions may be given.

Submitted.

(U.K. JHA)
Assistant Legal Adviser
14.10.1993.

Adl. L.A.

Submitted for approval of A.S.

Phanug
18/10

A.S. (D.O. V.K. A)

Sh. Kannan, Ad. L.A.

Wlegl
19/10/93

Judg

Phanug
20/10

Shri V. P. Bhatia, V. secy. M/o Home Affairs, Public section.
Shri S. K. Kundu, c. g. Advo. M. sect. Calcutta, dept. legal affairs.
4, K. S. Roy Road. Cal-1.
M/o Law, Justice, Judl. Section. F. No. 22(2)/93-7. dt. 20/10/93

नं० सं० अ० सं०
P. S. to Adl. Secy.
नं० सं०/Dy. No. 29/10/93
दिनांक/Dated.... 1.11.93

-5-

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Reference this Ministry's note on pages 1-3/ante and the Department of Legal Affairs' note on page 4/ante.

2. Formal approval of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Additional Solicitor General for representing the Union of India and the Attorney General again on 6th December, 1993, has already been obtained. However, Shri Altaf Ahmad, Additional Solicitor General who settled the affidavit on behalf of Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs claiming privilege could not go on the last date of hearing i.e. 29th September, he was consulted again if he could now make it convenient to attend the hearing in the Calcutta High Court on 6th December, 1993. He has very kindly agreed to represent the Union of India etc. It has also been indicated by him that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parmeswaran, Deputy Central Government Advocate, Central Agency Section, Supreme Court during this hearing on 6th December, 1993.

3. As per the scheme of the Department of Legal Affairs about the engagement of Law Officers, necessary court fee will be borne by the Branch Secretariat, Calcutta and board and lodging arrangements will be made and settled by this Ministry.

4. Before we go in for making necessary to and fro journey arrangements by air as also board and lodging arrangements, the Ministry of Law & Justice, Department of Legal Affairs (Judicial Section) may kindly see and agree to the engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmad, Additional Solicitor General assisted by Shri P. Parmeswaran, Deputy Central Government Advocate for the hearing in the Calcutta High Court on 6th December, 1993.

5. This may kindly be treated as Most Urgent.

(V.P. Bhatia)

Under Secretary/1-12-1993

DIRECTOR(O&M & VIG.)

JS(A)

Letter has been discussed today with the Addl L.A. Shri P.C. Kanna. Approved 2-12-93

MINISTRY OF LAW & JUSTICE, DEPTT. OF LEGAL AFFAIRS(SHRI U.K. JHA, ASSTT. LEGAL ADVISER, ROOM NO.441-A)
MHA U.O. NOTE No.1/27/91-Public dated 1-12-1993.

Tone

AZA(Jha)

9671/93

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

[Signature]
(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.C.

058291-U

[Signature]
10/12

पि. स. नं. ८०
P. S. to Addl. Secy
डा. सं. सं. नं. ८७४
दि. १०/१२/९३

A.S.

Umeero
10/12

Addl. LA. (Mr. Kannan)

[Signature]
13/12

Jyoti

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Public Section)



Public
16/12

2. Singh
[Signature]
13/12
Es H *[Signature]*

MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

Subject:- C.O. 6720(W)/93 - Bijan Ghosh Versus Union of India and Others in the High Court of Calcutta.

This case was discussed yesterday with the Additional Solicitor-General by me along with the Deputy Central Government Advocate.

2. I mentioned that Court Notice has been served in this case upon the Attorney-General of India and the High Court expects the Attorney-General to appear or to be properly represented.

3. The next date of hearing is 29 September, 1993 (the coming Wednesday).

4. The original Court Notice, stated to have been served upon the Attorney-General, does not seem to have been received in this Ministry. However, copies of the papers received from the Department of Legal Affairs are sent herewith. The Department of Legal Affairs ID No. 44(5)/93-Judl dated 16.2.1993 says that the Court Notice in original served upon the Attorney-General is enclosed. However, it has not been received in this Ministry.

5. The Attorney-General is already aware of this case. The Deputy Central Government Advocate may please get in touch with him and arrange for the Attorney-General to be represented in Court on 29 September, 1993.

6. During discussion yesterday, the Additional Solicitor-General suggested that we should seek adjournment on 29.9.1993 after filing the Affidavit claiming privilege in respect of the records. On the next date of hearing, the Additional Solicitor-General will himself appear on behalf of the Union of India. It is possible that the Attorney-General will also be represented by him in the Court.

7. Necessary action may kindly be taken immediately and this Ministry informed today itself about the position.

M. Venkateswara Iyer
(M. Venkateswara Iyer)
Joint Secretary

Shri P. Parmeshwaran
Shri P. Parmeshwaran, Deputy Central Government Advocate, Central Agency Section, Supreme Court, New Delhi.

MHA ID No. 1/27/91-Public dated 27.9.1993

*Received
27/9/93*

*This may be
sided. The
other pps may
be
left
with me
side. See
27/10*

8

Returned on 30th Sep Thursday

By morning flight.

7.00 AM to 9.00 AM

30/205



5419/25(14)/93
4/X/93

S. No. 1083
2521/Dir (L & M)/93
5/10

2160/92/10302
5/10/93
अपर महा-सल्लिसिटर
भारत

ADDITIONAL SOLICITOR-GENERAL
INDIA

Supreme Court of India,
New Delhi.
September 30, 1993

Dear Mr. Iyer,

Re: C.O. No.6720(W)/1993, Bijan Ghosh
Vs. Union of India.

Hearing in the above case before Justice Shyamal Sen went off quite well yesterday. The Judge clearly told the petitioner's counsel that unless the notification accepting Khosla Committee report was challenged and set aside, the presumption under the Evidence Act cannot be displaced. Several lawyers made strenuous efforts to incite the emotions of those present and the judge, but the judge remained unmoved. Eventually, the petitioner sought leave of the court to challenge the validity of the notification by which the Khosla Committee's report was accepted by the Government of India. A copy of the notification has already been placed by me on the record of the Court.

However, the court has desired that an additional affidavit should be filed by the Home Secretary explaining the delay in taking steps to comply orders of the Court on 3 earlier dates. A draft affidavit on the lines of lack of communication, giving specific references to the correspondence exchanged, may be drafted and the same may be got settled from me, if so desired. A copy of the notification and/or Press Communique of Rashtrapati Bhavan awarding Bharat Ratna to Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose is also required to be produced before the Court. The same can be annexed to the affidavit.

The court has also desired that Secretary, Education in the Ministry of Human Resource Development may file an affidavit explaining the reasons for non compliance of orders of the High Court. The best reason that can be mentioned is that that there has been no occupant of the post of Secretary, Human Resource Development since 1990. However, a draft affidavit may be got settled from me. Photo copies of the news report of today's Calcutta newspapers are enclosed for your information.

My fee bill (in triplicate) is also enclosed for early settlement.

With best wishes,

Yours sincerely,

(K.T.S. TULSI)

Mr. M. Venkateswara Iyer,
Joint Secretary,
Ministry of Home Affairs,
Government of India,
NEW DELHI

Put up on file
4/X
in (10/1/93)
5/10
no (1/93)
A. K. S. Tulsi

Netaji's nephew challenges death report

By Our Legal Reporter

CONTROVERSY

■ Calcutta High Court has directed the Union of India to produce copies of the Khosla Commission notification

IS Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose alive or dead? This question, agitating the minds of millions of people in India, was the central theme of the arguments advanced by Netaji's nephew, Mr. Amiya Nath Bose, and the Additional Solicitor-General of India, Mr. K. T. S. Tulsi, before Mr. Justice Shyamal Kumar Sen of Calcutta High Court on Wednesday.

Mr. Bose said the U.S. Intelligence report had come to a definite finding that there was no air crash at Taihoku in August, 1945. It had also concluded that Netaji had safely arrived in Manchuria some time in August, 1945. "This and other facts make it abundantly clear that Netaji did not die in any air crash at Taihoku", he said.

In December, 1945, Alfred Wagg, war correspondent of the Chicago Tribune, told Mr. Bose's father, the late Sarat Chandra Bose, that he had accompanied the Intelligence party that had been sent from General MacArthur's Headquarters to Taihoku to inquire into the alleged air crash there in August, 1945. Mr. Wagg said there was no air crash at Taihoku in August, 1945, as announced by the Domei news agency.

If the news broadcast from Japan that Netaji had died in a hospital at Taihoku was correct there should have been a death certificate. Mr. Bose said no such certificate had been produced either before the Shah Nawaz Committee or the Khosla Commission.

Mr. Bose submitted that one of the close confidants of Gandhiji, Khurshed Naoraji, had written a letter to Louis Fischer presumably on behalf of Gandhiji. He had annexed a photocopy of that letter to his affidavit. It conclusively proved that Netaji was alive in July, 1946. "This letter completely demolishes the story of the alleged air crash and the reports of the Shah Nawaz Committee and the Khosla Commission", he said, adding: "Netaji was in Russia in July, 1946".

Those who worked with Netaji in those days had stated that he used a round wrist watch. Mr. Bose took a wrist watch out of his pocket and said: "Here is a watch which is rectangular. I produce this watch for inspection by the court". The rectangular watch had been handed over to the Bose family by Jawaharlal Nehru, who claimed that it was found on Netaji's wrist after the air crash.

Mr. Bose said the Central Government's decision to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji posthumously was a "crude and clumsy" attempt to dishonour him. The Government had not disclosed why it had decided to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji posthumously. The Government had neither disclosed any material or document to prove when, where and how Netaji died. The people of India had a right to detailed information about the alleged death of

Netaji, he said.

In his affidavit, Mr. Bose alleged that it was Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister who had obstructed a full inquiry into the alleged air crash in which Netaji had allegedly died. He asked the present Prime Minister, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, to disclose how, when and where Netaji died after July, 1946 because it was he who had decided to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji "posthumously".

The Additional Solicitor-General of India who appeared for the Union of India, filed the affidavit of the Home Secretary of the Union Government who, he said, claimed privilege for certain documents. The Home Secretary said he could not disclose the advice given to the President in regard to the declaration of the posthumous award of Bharat Ratna for Netaji.

Recalling Netaji's glorious contribution to India's freedom struggle Mr. Tulsi said that in deciding to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji posthumously the Union Government had acted according to law. Section 108 of the Indian Evidence Act says that when the question is whether a man is alive or dead, and it is proved that he has not been heard of for seven years by those who would naturally have heard of him if he had been alive the burden of proving that he is alive is shifted to the person who affirms.

The Additional Solicitor-General submitted that the controversy over Netaji's death should continue. But the Government decided to confer Bharat Ratna on Netaji in deference to the wishes of the people of India. He said: "Since 1945 nobody has heard about Netaji. The fact remains that nobody claims to have heard about him".

In 1971, Mr. Samar Guha made a statement that Netaji was alive. He had taken to saying that Netaji would appear but he did not. Mr. Guha moved a motion in Parliament, demanding a third commission of inquiry into the alleged death of Netaji. But some time later himself sought the permission of the House to withdraw his motion.

Mr. Tulsi said there was legal provision for cancellation of such awards. The President acted according to law in announcing the award. The Union Government would not withdraw the award.

Mr. Justice Sen passed an order saying that the Secretary to the Education Department under the Ministry of Human Resources Development should file an affidavit giving reasons for the delay in filing the affidavit on behalf of the Union of India. Mr. Samar Guha should be added as a party to this case. The Union of India was directed to produce copies of the Khosla Commission notification. Copies of the Press communique issued by Rashtrapati Bhavan announcing the award should be supplied to the petitioners and the added parties.

Mr. Bijon Ghosh, the writ petitioner who challenged the posthumous award to Netaji, appeared in person. Mr. Nigam Chakravarti with Miss Arundhati Mukherjee appeared with some added parties. Mr. Tulsi appeared with Rajiv Malhotra, Mr. R. N. Das and Mr. Susanta Kundu.

The matter will come up for hearing on December 6.

Death still a mystery, says govt

KGB files may solve Netaji case

BY OUR SPECIAL
CORRESPONDENT

Calcutta, Sept. 29: The KGB archives in Moscow may provide a clue to Netaji's disappearance in Stalin's Russia, Mr Amiyanath Bose, nephew of the freedom fighter, argued in Calcutta High Court today.

Mr Bose, who was deposing in the case concerning conferment of Bharat Ratna on Netaji, wondered how the nation's highest award could be posthumously bestowed on Netaji when relevant facts concerning his demise were yet to be disclosed.

Disputing the Khosla Commission's inference that Subhas Chandra Bose had died in a plane crash in Taihoku, he said Dr Radha Binode Pal who was a

member of the War Trial Commission had told Netaji's elder brother, Sarat Bose, that the American intelligence agency was of the opinion Netaji had reached Manchuria.

Mr Bose argued that though a number of KGB files were destroyed after the Soviet government went out of power, the archives could still provide some evidence of Netaji's last days in Stalin's Russia.

The additional solicitor general of the Union government, Mr K.T.S. Tulsi, who had flown into the city for this case said the Centre's home secretary had filed an affidavit claiming "privilege" for certain documents.

In the affidavit, the home secre-

tary had said he could not disclose the advice given to the President prior to the declaration of Bharat Ratna. Praising Netaji's role in the freedom struggle, Mr Tulsi agreed that Netaji's death was still shrouded in controversy.

At the same time, he argued that the onus of unfolding the mystery of Netaji's disappearance was on those who were challenging the conclusion of the Khosla Commission's report.

The Indian Evidence Act clearly stated that if a man was not seen or even heard of as seen for a period of seven years, it could be assumed that he was not alive. He said even Mr Samar Guha, former MP, who had raised the

demand in Parliament that a third commission be appointed later withdrew the motion.

Justice Shyamal Sen after listening to both sides ruled that the secretary of education, under the ministry of human resources would file another affidavit giving reasons for its delay in submission of their affidavit.

He said Mr Samar Guha, the former MP, who has been referred to by Mr Tulsi in his argument be added as a party in the case. He directed the Centre to produce the Khosla Commission notification and the notification relating to posthumous Bharat Ratna award within a week. The next hearing of the case has been fixed on December 6.

12
BY SPEED POST

No.1/27/91-Public
Government of India/ Bharat Sarkar
Ministry of Home Affairs/ Grih Mantralaya

New Delhi, the 21st October, 1993.

To

Shri S.K. Kundu,
Central Government Advocate,
Ministry of Law, Justice & Company Affairs,
Branch Secretariat,
4, K.S. Roy Road,
Calcutta-1.

Subject:-Engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Additional Solicitor General in writ petition C.O.6720(W)/93 - Bijan Ghosh versus Union of India.

Sir,

Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, Additional Solicitor General who was engaged by the Ministry of Home Affairs in the above writ petition represented the Union of India and the Attorney General also in the High Court of Calcutta on 29th September, 1993. As required under the Scheme of engagement of Law Officers, the matter regarding engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi was referred to the Department of Legal Affairs for ex-post facto approval. The same has now been obtained from the Department of Legal Affairs. A copy of this approval has also been endorsed to you vide Ministry of Law & Justice, Judicial Section's No.F.22(2)/93 - Judl. dated 20-10-1993. However, a copy of this approval is enclosed for ready reference.

2. According to Department of Legal Affairs' O.M. No.F.18(1)/66-Judl. dated 12th January, 1987, relating to revision of fee payable to Law Officers w.e.f. 1st January, 1987, with particular reference to para 2(a) viz.

"For appearances in the Supreme Court and High Courts at Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Karnataka, the expenditure in connection with the fee payable to Law Officers is to be borne by the Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Law & Justice. The fee bills are to be processed by the concerned Litigation Sections or the Branch Secretariat of this Department, as the case may be, and the payment is to be made to the Law Officers by them directly."

The fee bill preferred by Shri K.T.S. Tulsi is to be processed by the Branch Secretariat, Calcutta and the payment is to be made to the Law Officer by that Secretariat directly. The bill in triplicate (duly pre-receipted) for an amount of Rs.4000/- is sent in original with the request that it may be settled expeditiously and payment made to Shri Tulsi as per the provisions contained in the O.M. referred to above read with Notification of even number dated 1st January, 1987, regarding the Law Officers' (Conditions of service) Rules, 1987, which have been published in the Extra-ordinary Gazette of India on 1st January, 1987.

3. It is requested that action taken in the matter may be communicated to this Ministry also.

Yours faithfully,

(V.P. Bhatia)

Under Secretary to the Govt. of India.

ENCLOS: (i) Copy of the note conveying ex-post-facto approval to the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi
(ii) Pre-Receipted Bill (in Triplicate) for an amount of Rs. 4000/-

गारी किया
ISSUED
C. R. Section M.H.A.

By Speed Post
Please issue
21/10/93

9671/93

- 613

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Agg LA

Ok
(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.C.

Phoney
10/12

A.S.

Unrec.c
10/12

Addl. LH. (Mr. Kannan)

Jyoti

Phoney
13/12

Minister of Home Affairs
(Public Section)

addl. Secy

9671/93

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsī, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsī could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Adg. Lr.

U.K. JHA 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

Phelan
10/12

A.S.

Unlabeled
10/12

Addl. G.A. (Mr. Kannan)

Tydel

13/12

Minister of Home Affairs
(Legal Section)

9671/93

-15

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Agd LA

U.K. JHA 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

Phoney
10/12

A.S.

Umeero
10/12

Addl. LA. (Mr. Kannan) Phoney

Jyoti

13/12

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Public Section)

No.
Addl. Secy
No.
ed

Amph
13/12

9671/93

-16-

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Asst LA

(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

10/12

A.S.

Unrecd
10/12

Addl. LA. (Mr. Kannan) 13/12
Jyoti

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Public Section)

13/12

9671/93

- 6- 17

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Ad L.A.

(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

Phelan
10/12

A.S.

Unrecd
10/12

Addl. L.A. (Mr Kannan)

Jyoti

Phelan
13/12

Minister of Home Affairs.
(Public Section).

amh
14/12

9671/93

- 6- 18

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Advt. A

JK
(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.C.

Phoney
10/12

A.S.

Unrecd
10/12

Addl. G.A. (Mr. Kannan) Recd
Jy. Adl 13/12

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Public Section)

Addl. Secy
No. 874
10/12/93

9671/93

- 6 - 19

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Asst. LA

(U.K. JHA) 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

10/12

A.S.

Unrecd
10/12

Addl. LA. (Mr. Kannan) 13/12
Jy. Lal

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Police Section).

Addl. Secy
No. 874
10/12/93

10/12

9671/93

- 6- 20

Department of Legal Affairs
Judicial Section

...

The proposal relates to the approval for engagement of Shri Altaf Ahmed, ASG for his appearance in the High Court of Calcutta in W.P.No. CO 6720/93 - Bijan Ghose v. Union of India.

2. In the above noted matter, we had earlier approved the engagement of Shri K.T.S. Tulsi, but it appears from the Department's note that Shri Tulsi could not go. Shri Altaf Ahmed has, however, given his consent to appear in the case. He has indicated that he would like to be assisted by Shri P. Parameswaran, Addl. Government Advocate, CAS, Supreme Court on the next date of hearing.

3. In view of the above, the proposal is submitted for approval on the usual terms and conditions as applicable to Law Officer.

Submitted pl.

Agd LA

U.K. JHA 10/12
Assistant Legal Adviser.

Submitted for approval of A.L.

Phoney
10/12

A.S.

Unno
10/12

Addl. LA. (Mr. Kannan) Phoney

Tydel

Ministry of Home Affairs
(Public Section)

2. Secy
Addl. Secy
v. No.
led